

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 were presented for examination and claims 1-54 were rejected. In the present amendment, claims 1, 3, 6-9, 18, 19, 34-37, 40, 41 and 48 have been amended. Applicants further add claim 55 as a new claim dependent on claim 1 and claim 56 as a new claim dependent on claim 35. No new matter has been introduced. Support for claims 55 and 56 can be found in paragraphs 73 and 76 of the present disclosure. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-21 and 23-56 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 35 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-21 and 23-56 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**I. Objections to References**

The Examiner objected to references B49, B50, C1, C50, and C62. Specifically, the Examiner objected to references B49 and B50 as missing. The Examiner objected to C1 and C62 as lacking publication dates. The Examiner objected to C50, “Integrating Heterogeneous and Distributed Information by Linking it to Structured Information as an ‘Information Integration Directory’”, Takahashi *et al.*, as lacking a translation. Applicants concurrently submit herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure statement addressing these objections.

In the Supplemental Information Disclosure statement, Applicants submit a copy of EP13330705, published as WO 02/037267, for reference B49. Similarly, Applicants submit a

copy of EP1364296, published as WO 02/023362, for reference B50. For references C1 and C62, Applicants have identified the corresponding publication dates. For reference C50, Applicants submit an English translation of the abstract. Applicants believe all of the Examiner's objections have been addressed, and respectfully request consideration of all of the references in the supplemental information disclosure statement.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

II. Claims 1-13, 20, 21, 23-38 and 45-54 as Anticipated by Pfitzner

Claims 1-13, 20, 21, 23-38 and 45-54 are rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0215826 A1 to Pfitzner ("Pfitzner") under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 1 and 35 are independent claims. Claims 2-12, 20, 21, 23-34 and 54 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, amended herein. Claims 36-38 and 45-53 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 35, amended herein. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Pfitzner fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention as amended.

A. Independent Claims 1 and 35 Not Anticipated by Pfitzner

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claim 1 is directed towards a method and independent claim 35 is directed towards a system. These claims recite an access control server receiving a request for a file having a native file type. The access control server determines a level of access for the file and determines a second file type. The file

contents are presented to the client using an application program associated with the second file type. Pfizner fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Pfizner fails to disclose determining, responsive to a level of access determined in an access control decision, a second file type for presentation to the client. Rather than determining a file type, Pfizner determines a business object type of the requested file – a sales order, customer information, or an appointment, for example (“Examples of a business object include information about a customer, an employee, a product, a business partner, a product, a sales invoice, and a sales order.” *Pfizner*, para. 27, lines 14-17). Even if the Examiner considers the business object type to include a file type, this would merely be the native file type of the requested business object. Pfizner does not determine a second file type, nor even a second business object type. Instead, Pfizner presents only the original business object requested in its native type – e.g. the original sales order, customer information, or appointment.

In the Office Action, the Examiner reads Pfizner’s redirection decision rules to be the access decision of the claimed invention (Office Action of 12/11/08, page 2, lines 1-2). However, Pfizner does not determine either an application program or a second business object type responsive to the redirection decision rules. The business object type of Pfizner is inherent to the requested file (“... the received address may identify the type of business object to be accessed, such as a sales order, customer information, or an appointment.” *Pfizner*, para. 38, lines 1-3). Thus, Pfizner fails to disclose determining, responsive to a level of access determined in an access control decision, a second file type for presentation to the client.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, Pfizner fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 1 and 35. Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 35 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-12, 20, 21, 23-34, and 54 depend on and

incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 36-38 and 45-53 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 35. Thus, claims 2-12, 20, 21, 23-34, 36-38 and 45-54 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-13, 20, 21, 23-38 and 45-54 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

III. Claims 14-19 and 39-44 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 14-16 and 39-44 are rejected as unpatentable over Pfitzner in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,581 B1 to Hofmann et al. (“Hofmann”) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 17 is rejected as unpatentable over Pfitzner in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0023421 A1 to Numao et al. (“Numao”) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 18 and 19 are rejected as unpatentable over Pfitzner in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,868,451 B1 to Peacock (“Peacock”) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 14-19 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 39-44 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 35, as amended. Applicants traverse these rejections and submit that Pfitzner, Hofmann, Numao, and Peacock, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, as amended.

A. Dependent claims 14-19, 39-44 Patentable over Pfitzner, Hofmann, Numao, and Peacock

In view of these arguments above in connection with the rejection of independent claims 1 and 35, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 35 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 14-19 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of

independent claim 1. Claims 39-44 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 35. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 14-19 and 39-44 are also patentable and in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, Pfitzner, Hofmann, Numao, and Peacock, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. As pointed out above, Pfitzner fails to disclose determining, responsive to a level of access determined in an access control decision, a second file type for presentation to the client. The Examiner cites Hofmann for the purpose of describing a discovery agent as a collection agent. The discovery agent does not make access control decisions or determine file types for presentation. As such, Hofmann fails to bridge the factual deficiencies of Pfitzner. Additionally, the Examiner cites Numao for the purpose of describing an access control server rejecting a request. However, upon denial of access, Numao merely outputs a “denied” data string (*Numao*, paragraph 62), and not a second file type. As such, Numao fails to bridge the factual deficiencies of Pfitzner. Furthermore, the Examiner cites Peacock for the purpose of identifying a file type from a file extension. However, the file type in Peacock is the native file type of a requested file. Peacock’s file extension database neither makes access control decisions nor determines a second file type for presentation responsive to a level of access. As such, Peacock also fails to bridge the factual deficiencies of Pfitzner.

Because Pfitzner, Hofmann, Numao, and Peacock, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants submit that these references fail to detract from the patentability of independent claims 1 and 35 and dependent claims 14-19 and 39-44. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 14-19 and 39-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: February 11, 2009

/Christopher J. McKenna/
Christopher J. McKenna, Esq.
Registration No. 53,302
Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000